

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022

CrI.M.P.No. 12333/2022

in

D-1 Triplicane P.S. Crime No. 382/2022

Vinoth

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
D-1 Triplicane Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. T.V. Somasundaram, U. Yuvaraj, A. Vinothkumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 3.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 324, 397, 427 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 382/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Heard both sides.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 3.6.2022 and prays for granting bail.
4. According to CPP, on 31.5.2022 at about 3.00 a.m. this petitioner demanded match box from the defacto complainant. On his refusal, this petitioner abused him in filthy language and assaulted him using wooden log and knife and caused injury to him. Victim was admitted to hospital and after 2 days of treatment, he has been discharged. He further submits that this petitioner is having 2 previous cases.

5. It is reported by the CPP that victim was discharged from the hospital after two days of treatment. The petitioner is in custody for more than one month. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

(c) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

(f) If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 12333/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 12519/2022

in

K.1, Sembium P.S. Crime No.404/2022

G. Vadivel Pandian

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K.1, Sembium Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. N.M. Nijamudheen, N. Nishar Ahamed, A. Joyse, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 30.5.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 457, 380 of IPC in Crime No.404/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. Petitioner's name does not find a place in the FIR. He has been falsely implicated in this case for statistical purpose. The property involved in this case has been recovered. The petitioner is in custody from 30.5.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that this petitioner/A1 along with another accused trespassed into the defacto complainant's house and committed theft of 19 1/2 sovereigns of jewels. He further submits that this petitioner is having 3 previous

cases. However, according to CPP, the entire property involved in this case has been recovered and A2 was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court.

5. It is reported by the CPP that the property involved in this case has been recovered and that A2 was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court. The petitioner is in custody for more than 1 ½ months. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

(c) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

(f) If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 12519/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 12520/2022

in

C-4 R.G.G.G.H P.S. Crime No.60/2022

Palani

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
C-4 R.G.G.G.H Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Kesavan, A. Jotheeswaran, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 4.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 354 IPC and sec. 4 of TNPHW Act in Crime No.60/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. He is working as ward assistant for the past 20 years. On the date of occurrence, this petitioner took the defacto complainant in a wheel chair to the dialysis room for dialysis. On the way to dialysis room wordy quarrel arose between them. Hence, this false complaint has been given by the defacto complainant against the petitioner with an ulterior motive. The petitioner is in custody from 4.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that the defacto complainant is admitted in Government General Hospital as inpatient. On 30.6.2022, this petitioner

outraged the modesty of the complainant by way of molesting and pulling her dress. Investigation is not yet completed. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. This petitioner is working as Ward assistant in Government General Hospital. The defacto complainant is a Chronic Kidney Dialysis patient and she has been admitted as inpatient in the said hospital. As per the FIR, the allegation against the petitioner is that he outraged the modesty of the defacto complainant by molesting her. Admittedly, there is no chance for enmity between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. Hence, there is no necessity for the defacto complainant to lodge such a heinous complaint against the petitioner. Therefore, this court is of the opinion that chances for exaggeration of complaint does not arise. The petitioner was arrested only on 4.7.2022. Investigation is not yet completed. If the petitioner is released on bail, chances for absconding is more. In the above said circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 12523/2022

in

S.C No. 78/2019

(on the file of XIX Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai)

in

P-4 Basin Bridge P.S. Crime No. 3/2013

Settu @ Karthikeyan

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P-4 Basin Bridge Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

The above petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M. Illiyas, A. Venkateswara Babu, M. Mohamadhu Ajar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 17.3.2022 on execution of NBW for the offence punishable under Section 341, 302 r/w 34 IPC in S.C.No. 78/2019 on the file of XIX Additional Sessions Court, Chennai in Crime No. 3/2013 on the file respondent police seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since this petitioner's mother suffering from illness, he could not appear before the trial court on the hearing date and therefore, NBW was issued against him on 1.9.2021. This petitioner's absence is neither wilful nor wanton. He is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed on him. He is in custody from 17.3.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, NBW was issued against the petitioner on 1.9.2021 and it was executed on 17.3.2022. The petitioner was absent for six months. The case is of the year 2013 that too murder case. After much effort, the police secured the petitioner. If he is released on bail, the further proceedings of the case will be stalled. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 11 previous cases. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a case of 302 IPC. The case is of the year 2013. NBW was issued against the petitioner on 1.9.2021 and it was executed on 17.3.2022. In the meantime, this petitioner has not chosen to surrender and recall the warrant. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 11 previous cases. If he is released on bail, he will again get abscond and will not be available for trial. This court finds force in the contention of CPP. The conduct of the petitioner does not inspire the confidence of the court that he will be available for trial if he is released on bail. Under the above circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 12524/2022

in

K-7 ICF P.S. Crime No. 87/2022

Vadivel

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-7 ICF Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Saritha, M. Reena, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 16.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 336, 397, 427 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 87/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 16.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, on 16.7.2022, at about 2.30 p.m. this petitioner/A2 along with two other accused after having lunch at defacto complainant's food centre, refused to pay the money. Due to which wordy quarrel arose between them and the accused robbed Rs.500/- from the defacto complainant's shop and escaped from the spot. He further submits that the arrest of the petitioner is very recent one. Hence, he objects the grant of bail.

5. It is a case of robbery. This petitioner was arrested only on 16.7.2022. According to CPP, the antecedents of the petitioner is yet to be ascertained. It is too early to release the petitioner on bail. Considering the above facts, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 12525/2022

in

G-2 Periamet P.S. Crime No. 158/2022

Sakthivel

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
G-2 Periamet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. T.V. Somasundaram, U. Yuvaraj, A. Vinothkumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 30.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 394 r/w 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 158/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. He is aged 19 years. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is in custody from 30.6.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, the defacto complainant who is working as a Lorry Driver proceeding to Virgo Co., at Apparao Garden, Periamet with sunmaica load and stopped the vehicle to enquire about the route to the said company and asked the petitioner the way to Virgo Co., But, this petitioner demanded money. For which, the defacto complainant refused to give money. Suddenly, this petitioner attacked the defacto complainant's head using knife and forcibly robbed Rs.600/- from him and ran away from the spot. Due to the

said attack, the defacto complainant admitted in hospital for one day and thereafter discharged. He further submits that this petitioner is having one previous case.

5. It is reported by the CPP that victim was discharged from the hospital after one day treatment. The petitioner is in custody for the past three weeks. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. Considering the above facts, age of the petitioner and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

(c) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

(f) If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The II Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 12525/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022

CrI.M.P.No. 12528/2022

in

H-6 R.K. Nagar P.S. Crime No. 415/2022

1. S. Karthick
2. Ayub
3. Kadher

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
H-6 R.K. Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. A. Salmankhan, G. Dilip Kumar, S. Carolin Esabella, A. Jayakumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, who were arrested on 14.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 324, 307 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 415/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent of the offence. They are no way connected with the alleged offence. They have not committed any offence as narrated in the FIR. There is no specific overtact attributed against the petitioners. They are ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed on them. The petitioners are in custody from 14.7.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 5 accused and these petitioners are arrayed as A3 to A5. A1 is still absconding. During the course of wordy quarrel, these petitioners along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant's

brother using iron rod and caused grievous head injury to him. Due to which, the victim was admitted to Stanley hospital and still he is taking treatment as inpatient. Investigation is at an early stage. Arrest of the petitioners is very recent one. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the nature of injury sustained by the victim, the fact that victim is still taking treatment in hospital, prime accused is yet to be arrested, short duration of custody and that investigation is at an early stage, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 12529/2022

in

E-3 Teynampet P.S. Crime No. 222/2022

M. Raghuman Mohammed Anifa

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
E-3 Teynampet Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. K. Panjamurthy, M. Arunchori, M. Varundev, Lalith R. Nevathithan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 22.6.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 294(b), 341, 336, 427, 392, 397 and 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 222/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. He has nothing to do with the alleged offence. False case has been foisted on him only for statistical purpose. The petitioner is in custody from 22.6.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that this petitioner waylaid the defacto complainant and robbed Rs.700/- from him at knife point. He further submits that this petitioner is a habitual offender and having 6 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

5. Considering the nature of offence and antecedents of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022

CrI.M.P.No. 12530/2022

in

C.C.No. 6560/2022

(on the file of II Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai)

in

G-1 Vepery P.S. Crime No. 154/2022

Gopal Kumar Tanti

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
G-1 Vepery Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.R. Muthukumar, R. Lingakumar, D. Jaisankar, P. Muthumari, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.5.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 381 IPC r/w 465, 468, 471, 120(B) IPC in Crime No.154/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody from 15.5.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that totally 3 accused involved in this case. This petitioner is arrayed as A1. A2 and A3 are still absconding. The defacto complainant lodged the complaint stating that on 30.4.2022, the defacto complainant and his wife went to Kashmir and they returned on 4.5.2022 at 11.00 p.m. and noticed that all the gold and diamond jewels worth about Rs.1,20,00,000/- including cash Rs.2 lakhs was

looted by their servant Karan. Before 4 years, one Raju, who worked in the defacto complainant's house stolen away two gold bangles. All the accused conspired together and planned to commit theft in the defacto complainant's house. For which, this petitioner fabricated forged Aadhar card of one Mantkumar Pandi in the name of Karan and sent him to the defacto complainant's house as servant with criminal intention. The value of the stolen jewels/articles is worth about Rs.1,20,00,000/- including cash Rs.2 lakhs. The properties involved in this case is not yet recovered. This petitioner and two other absconded accused are native of Jharkant State. Prime accused are yet to be arrested. This petitioner has no permanent address at Chennai. The police secured the petitioner after much effort. If he is released on bail, there is every possibility for his abscondence. Hence, he seriously objects the grant of bail.

5. The value of the looted articles is very huge. The stolen properties are not yet recovered. Prime accused are still absconding and they are yet to be arrested. All the accused conspired together and hatched a criminal conspiracy with intention to commit theft at defacto complainant's house while he went out-station. The allegation against the petitioner is that he fabricated forged Aadhar Card of one Mantkumar Pandi in the name of Karan and sent him to defacto complainant's house to commit the crime. This petitioner is native of Jharkant State. Further, this petitioner has no permanent address at Chennai. If he is released on bail, chances for absconding is on the higher side. In the above said circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge**

Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No. 12531/2022

in

F-2 Egmore P.S. Crime No. 276/2022

A. Sadam Hussain

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
F-2 Egmore Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M. Mohamed Nazar, S.Jeeva, Amanulla, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 1.7.2022 for the offence punishable under Section 341, 294(b), 307, 506(ii) and 353 IPC and sec. 4 of TNPHW Act in Crime No. 276/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the offence. He is no way connected with the alleged offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Dispute between husband and wife. No one sustained injury in this case and no one is hospitalized. This petitioner is in custody from 30.6.2022 and prays for granting bail.

4. According to CPP, due to family dispute, quarrel arose between the petitioner and his wife. The defacto complainant who is a police officer returning from his duty heard the quarrel between the petitioner and his wife and he came to solve their dispute. At that time, this petitioner tried to attack the defacto complainant under the influence of alcohol. But, he escaped from the said assault. Investigation is still pending. He further submits that this petitioner is having 3 previous cases and objects the grant of bail.

5. It is reported that no one sustained injury in this case. The petitioner is in custody for the past 20 days. Major portion of investigation might have been completed by this time. According to CPP, this petitioner is having 3 previous cases. However, considering the fact that no one sustained injury and the duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

(c) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

(f) If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. The XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

vv

Crl.M.P.No. 12531/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present : Tmt.S.Alli, M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge.

Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022.

Crl.M.P.No.12521/2022

in

K-11, C.M.B.T. P.S. Crime No.251/2022

Jayaprakash

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-11, C.M.B.T. Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.P.Krishna Moorthy, K.Rohini, S.Gopi and A.Karthick, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 10.6.2022 for the offences punishable under Section 379 of IPC in Crime No.251/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner is in custody from 10.6.2022. Hence, he may be granted bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that the petitioner along with another accused snatched cellphone from the defacto complainant while he was walking on the road. Cellphone recovered. The petitioner has no previous case.

4. The petitioner is in custody from 10.6.2022. Property has been recovered. By this time, investigation is almost completed. The petitioner has no previous case. Considering the nature of case and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(c) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

(f) If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me today in open court.

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to :

1. The learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.12521/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present : Tmt.S.Alli, M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge.

Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022.

Crl.M.P.No.12522/2022

in

K-11, C.M.B.T. P.S. Crime No.186/2022

Vijay @ Vijaya Kumar

.. Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
K-11, C.M.B.T. Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s.S.Senthil Kumar, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 18.6.2022 for the offences punishable under Section 379 of IPC in Crime No.186/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioner is in custody from 18.6.2022. Hence, he may be granted bail.
3. On the other hand, the learned CPP submits that when the defacto complainant was waiting at the Koyambedu Metro Station, the accused snatched his cellphone. The property has been recovered and the petitioner is having four previous cases.
4. Property has been recovered. The petitioner is in custody from 18.6.2022. By this time, investigation is almost completed. Considering the nature of case and duration of custody, this court is inclined to grant bail.
5. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

(c) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

(f) If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me today in open court.

Principal Sessions Judge.

Copy to :

1. The learned V Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

ss

Crl.M.P.No.12522/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No.12340/2022

in

P.3, Vyasarpadi P.S. Cr.No.309/2022

1. Ajay @ Karuvadu

2. Panneer @ Panneerselvam

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

P.3, Vyasarpadi Police Station,

Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. D. Prasanna Kumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 294(b), 341, 324, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.309/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. It is a case in counter. The petitioners are noway connected with the alleged offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant with knife and stones. It is a case in counter. The victim was discharged after 2 days of in-patient treatment. He further submits that the 2nd petitioner is having no previous case. Whereas the 1st petitioner is having 7 previous cases.

5. It is a case in counter. The allegation against the petitioners is that these petitioners along with other accused attacked the defacto complainant with knife and stones. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. However, considering the bad antecedents, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the 1st petitioner. As far as the 2nd petitioner is concerned, considering the fact that he has no previous case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the 2nd petitioner alone on condition.

6. Accordingly, the 2nd petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the 2nd petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

[a] the 2nd petitioner and the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank Pass book to ensure their identity.

[b] the 2nd petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

[c] the 2nd petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the 2nd petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the 2nd petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the 2nd petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

[f] If the 2nd petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

7. As far as the 1st petitioner is concerned, petition is dismissed.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. Learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, P.3, Vyasarpadi Police Station, Chennai.

nmk

CrI.M.P.No.12340/2022

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No.12341/2022

in

P.3, Vyasarpadi P.S. Cr.No.310/2022

1. Shankar @ Sankar
2. Sham @ Sridhar
3. Purushoth @ Purushothaman

.. Petitioners/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
P.3, Vyasarpadi Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M.R. Magesh Kumar, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioners, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 294(b), 341, 324, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.310/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. It is a case in counter. The petitioners are noway connected with the alleged offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that these petitioners have attacked the defacto complainant with knife and caused injuries. It is a case in counter. The victim was discharged after 2 days of in-patient treatment. He further submits that the petitioners are having no previous case. He has not raised any serious objection.

5. It is a case in counter. The allegation against the petitioners is that these petitioners have attacked the defacto complainant with knife. According to learned CPP,

the injured has been discharged from the hospital and the petitioners have no previous case. He has not raised any serious objection. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable in nature. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners on condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

[a] the petitioners and the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank Pass book to ensure their identity.

[b] the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

[c] the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

[f] If the petitioners thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. Learned X Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, P.3, Vyasarpadi Police Station, Chennai.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No.12344/2022

in

F.5, Choolaimedu P.S. Cr.No.108/2022

Shanthi

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
F.5, Choolaimedu Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. N.Senthilkumar, R. Girija, J. Manikandan, J. Mercy, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following :

ORDER

1. The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged offence u/s. 294(b), 324, 506(ii) IPC in Cr.No.108/2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. She is noway connected with the alleged offence. She has been falsely implicated in this case. Injured has been discharged from the hospital. Co-accused was enlarged on bail. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police. Hence, prays for granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned CPP submits that during the course of wordy quarrel, this petitioner along her husband abused the defacto complainant and her husband and attacked the defacto complainant's husband with helmet and stones and also threatened him with dire consequences. However, he submits that the injured has been treated as out-patient and the petitioner has no previous case. A1 was enlarged on bail. He has not raised any serious objection.

5. Dispute between the parties over parking the Auto in front of the petitioners' road side flower shop. The allegation against the petitioner is that she along with her husband abused both the defacto complainant and he husband and attacked the defacto

complainant's husband. According to learned CPP, the injured has been treated as out-patient and the petitioner has no previous case. Arrested accused already released on bail. He has not raised any serious objection. Except Sec.506(ii) IPC, other offences are bailable in nature. Considering the above facts, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on condition.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on her appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of this order, before the learned XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that

[a] the petitioner and the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank Pass book to ensure their identity.

[b] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

[c] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560].

[f] If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copies to:

1. Learned XVII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. CPP, Chennai.
3. The Inspector of Police, F.5, Choolaimedu Police Station, Chennai.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.12345/2022

in

Crl.M.P.No.9335/2022

in

Crl.M.P.No.8867/2022

in

Crime No.388/2022

C. Ashok Kumar

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by
The Inspector of Police,
P.5, MKB Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. M.J. Senthil Kumar, M. J. Srinivas, B. Kannan, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

O R D E R

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8867/2022, dt:6.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8867/2022 on 6.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders. Subsequently, as per order dated 13.6.2022 in Crl.M.P.No.9335/2022, the petitioner's name which has been wrongly mentioned in the bail petition as C. Ashok has been modified as C. Ashok Kumar.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for the past 30 days. Considering the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.12346/2022

in

Crl.M.P.No.9144/2022

in

Crime No.195/2022

1. Vijaykumar
2. Jaishankar
3. Hari

... Petitioners/Accused.

vs.

State by
The Inspector of Police,
E.3, Teynampet Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. R. Vivekananthan, S. Senthilmurugan, K. Nivesh Kumar, M. Kruthika, J. Mahesh, Counsel for the petitioners and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. Petitioners seek relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9144/2022, dt:10.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioners were granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9144/2022 on 10.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioners have complied the condition for the past 30 days. Considering the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.12349/2022

in

Crl.M.P.No.9029/2022

in

Crime No.115/2022

Sarath Kumar @ Baba @ Sarath

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,
D.5, Marina Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Apunu, R. Kamesh, K. Subburaj, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9029/2022, dt:9.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9029/2022 on 9.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for the past 32 days. Considering the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.12350/2022

in

Crl.M.P.No.9135/2022

in

Crime No.115/2022

Praveenkumar @ Suthumama Praveen

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,
D.5, Marina Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Apunu, R. Kamesh, K. Subburaj, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9135/2022, dt:10.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9135/2022 on 10.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for the past 32 days. Considering the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.12347/2022

in

Crl.M.P.No.9028/2022

in

Crime No.116/2022

Sarath Kumar @ Baba @ Sarath

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,
D.5, Marina Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Apunu, R. Kamesh, K. Subburaj, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9028/2022, dt:9.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.9028/2022 on 9.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for the past 32 days. Considering the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.12351/2022

in

Crl.M.P.No.8759/2022

in

Crime No.116/2022

Praveenkumar @ Suthumama Praveen

... Petitioner/Accused.

vs.

State by

The Inspector of Police,
D.5, Marina Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. S. Apunu, R. Kamesh, K. Subburaj, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for the respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

1. Petitioner seeks relaxation of the condition imposed by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8759/2022, dt:6.6.2022.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8759/2022 on 6.6.2022 with condition to appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

4. According to learned CPP, the petitioner has complied the condition for the past 32 days. Considering the number of days complied, this court is inclined to relax the condition.

5. (i) Petition is allowed.

(ii) Condition is relaxed in toto.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022

Crl.M.P.No.12554/2022

in

C.A.No.134/2022

in

C.C.No.3012/2017

(on the file of learned Metropolitan Magistrate, CCB and CBCID Cases, Egmore, Chennai)

1. R. Hariharan
2. R. Visalakshi
3. G. Ramanathan

.. Petitioners/Appellants/
Accused 1 to 3

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Vepery,
Chennai.

.. Respondent/Respondent/
Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. T. Shanmugam, P.K. Harinath Babu, K.G. Sripathi, Counsel for the petitioners/appellants/A1 to A3 and upon hearing the petitioners side arguments, this court delivered the following

ORDER

1. Heard.

2. The petitioners in the above case seeks suspension of sentence pending disposal of the appeal.

3. The petitioners/appellants herein are A1 to A3 in C.C.No.3012/2017 on the file of Metropolitan Magistrate, CCB and CBCID Cases, Egmore, Chennai. On 20.6.2022, a judgment was pronounced in the above case and the petitioners/A1 to A3 were convicted u/s.467, 468, 471, 420, 465, 120B of IPC and each of them were sentenced

(i) to undergo R.I. for three years and to pay a fine of Rs.10000/- i/d. to undergo S.I. for 6 months each for the offence u/s.467 IPC;

(ii) to undergo R.I. for three years and to pay a fine of Rs.10000/- i/d. to undergo S.I. for 6 months each for the offence u/s.468 IPC ;

(iii) to undergo R.I. for two years and to pay a fine of Rs.10000/- i/d. to undergo S.I. for 6 months each for the offence u/s.467 IPC;

(iv) to undergo R.I. for three years and to pay a fine of Rs.5,000/- i/d. to undergo S.I. for 3 months each for the offence u/s.420 IPC;

(v) to undergo S.I. for two years and to pay a fine of Rs.5,000/- i/d. to undergo S.I. for 3 months each for the offence u/s.465 IPC;

(vi) to undergo S.I. for six months each for the offence u/s.120 B IPC;

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners have fair chance of success in the appeal. Hence, prays to suspend the sentence.

5. This court has also perused the memorandum of appeal and the submission made by the petitioner's side. Fine amount has been paid. The trial court has suspended the sentence. As already stated supra, the Petitioners/Appellants/A1 to A3 were ordered to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of three years and in these circumstances, it may not be right to hold that the petitioners have to serve the sentence during the pendency of the appeal. Considering the above facts, this Court is inclined to suspend the sentence of imprisonment.

6. Accordingly, the sentence of imprisonment imposed on the petitioners by the lower Court alone is hereby suspended till the disposal of the appeal and the petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail on their executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- each with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, CCB and CBCID Cases, Egmore, Chennai.

7. The appeal is made over to VI Additional City Civil Court, Chennai.

8. The appeal stands posted to 10.8.2022.

Delivered by me today in the open court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy

Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, CCB and CBCID Cases, Egmore, Chennai.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS AT CHENNAI

**Present: Tmt. S. Alli, M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge
Wednesday, the 20th day of July, 2022**

Crl.M.P.No.12527/2022

in

R.10, MGR Nagar P.S., Crime No.184/2018

M. Mohamed Rafique

.. Petitioner/Accused.

Vs.

State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
R.10, MGR Nagar Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of M/s. C.K.M. Appaji, P. Murthy, P. Sonu, R. Xavier, Counsel for the petitioner and of CPP for respondent and upon hearing them, this Court delivered the following:

ORDER

1. The petitioner, who was arrested on 7.7.2022 under P.T. Warrant for the offence punishable under Section 420 of IPC in Crime No.184/2018 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent. He is noway connected with the alleged offence. He has been arrayed as A2. The petitioner did not know the defacto complainant and the money was not transferred to the account of this petitioner. Since the petitioner is the father of A1, he has been falsely implicated in this case. In a similar case in Cr.No.167/2018, the petitioner was arrested on 14.6.2022, wherein he was granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court in Crl.O.P.No.15700/2022 on 7.7.2022. Immediately, the respondent police remanded the petitioner in this case under P.T. warrant. A1 in this case was already granted bail by the Court below. The petitioner is in custody for more than a month and hence, prays for granting bail.

4. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner along with his son/A1 were running a consultancy in the name and style of Bright Future Consultancy under the guise of securing overseas jobs and issued advertisements. Based on the on-line advertisement,

the defacto complainant contacted the firm and he was lured to part with money to secure a job in Canada and a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- along with Passport was handed over to A1. This petitioner/A2 induced the defacto complainant to pay the balance amount of Rs.2 lakhs immediately through on-line to go abroad very soon. Believing them, the defacto complainant has paid further sum of Rs.2 lakhs in instalments through on-line bank transaction. Neither they arranged the job nor returned the amount. Hence, the case.

5. According to learned CPP, several innocent job aspirants have been cheated by the accused. This petitioner is the main accused, who induced the victims to pay the amount. After collecting money, the accused are absconding by changing their residence. Though the case has been registered in the year 2018, the accused was secured only during 2022 by the respondent police with great difficulty. He is also involved in yet another case of similar nature in CCB, Cr.No.167/2018 and also a case in Cr.No.160/2010 on the file of R.9, Valasaravakkam P.S., Investigation is pending and hence seriously objects granting bail.

6. On perusal of the FIR, there are totally 2 accused. This petitioner is arrayed as A2. A1/Imranshah is the son of this petitioner. As per FIR, entire amount has been handed over to A1 by way of cash and through his bank account. As far as the petitioner is concerned, according to the prosecution, he only induced the victims to pay the amount. According to learned CPP the petitioner is having yet another case of similar nature and he was remanded in this case only on 8.7.2022 and investigation is pending. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner was in custody from 14.6.2022 in another case and the respondent police has not taken steps to remand him in this case in the earlier occasion and it has some force. Further it could be seen from the copy of the order in CrI.O.P.No.15700/2022, dated 15.7.2022, the Hon'ble High Court, Madras has granted bail to the petitioner in another case in Cr.No.167/2018. It is also reported that A1 in this case was already enlarged on bail by the Court below. Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case and also the period of incarceration by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner on the following condition.

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai and on further condition that

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar Card or Bank Pass Book to ensure their identity.

(b) the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m. until further orders.

(c) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(d) the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the above petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the above petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]**.

(f) If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

Delivered by me today in the open Court.

Principal Sessions Judge

Copy to :

1. Learned XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Chennai.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Puzhal.

nmk

Crl.M.P.No.12527/2022